



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the sources of the latter. To do so would be to go beyond the scope of the present work. As a translator Jehan de Vignay sinned in being too literally faithful to his original and too false to the genius of his own tongue. However, his clumsy style did not prevent a vogue which extended through nearly three centuries.

The last chapter of the dissertation is devoted to a description of the nine manuscripts containing the fables. The relationship of the manuscripts is given in tabular form. In forming his critical text Mr. Snavelly will, of course, also use the Latin of Vincent de Beauvais.

To sum up, the present dissertation offers a clear and scholarly account of the life and works of a little-known author. Mr. Snavelly has his bibliography well in hand. The second installment of his work promises to offer more that is new than the first.²

²Since the publication of Mr. Snavelly's dissertation in May, 1908, I have come across the mention of what is probably a tenth manuscript of Jehan de Vignay's fables. L. Delisle, *Recherches sur la Librairie de Charles V*, Paris, H. Champion, 1907, Vol. II, p. *307, gives a note on a manuscript purchased by Mr. H. Yates Thompson, the well-known English book collector, on Dec. 15, 1906. This manuscript at one time belonged to the duc de Berry, and it contains the first thirteen books of Jehan de Vignay's *Miroir Historial*. A rather full description of this new manuscript may be found in *Book-Prices Current*, Vol. XXI, p. 301, where it is stated that it was bought by Mr. Quaritch for £1290.

It may be further noted that, according to L. Roth, *Die mittelalterlichen Sammlungen lateinischer Thierfabeln*, Philologus, Vol. I (1846), pp. 523-546 (see p. 526), Vincent de Beauvais quotes Romulus fables singly in various places in his works ("und an verschiedenen stellen zerstreut") in addition to the collection of twenty-nine such fables studied by Mr. Snavelly in Jehan de Vignay's translation. These fables can hardly be identical with the twelve fables cited by J. Jacobs, *History of the Aesopic Fable*, pp. 229-268, from the pseudo *Speculum Morale*. Hence it is probable that a careful reading of the Old-French author's entire text would have disclosed additional fables for investigation to Mr. Snavelly.

Finally, it should be stated that in the slight fire which occurred in the Library of the Johns Hopkins University on September 17, 1908, the greater part of the official draft of Mr. Snavelly's dissertation was destroyed.—GEORGE C. KEIDEL, October, 1908.

GEORGE T. NORTHUP.

Princeton University.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

Bernardin de Saint-Pierre. La vie et les ouvrages de Jean-Jacques Rousseau, édition critique publiée avec de nombreux fragments inédits, par MAURICE SOURIAU. Société des Textes français modernes. Paris: Publications de la Société de Librairie et d'Édition, 1907.

This volume, published as No. VII, by the *Société des Textes Français Modernes*, will render valuable services, especially coming at a time when Rousseau studies are so much in favor.

The text was so far available only in the edition of 1836, which was practically useless for scientific purposes. Bernardin de Saint-Pierre had been prevented by other occupations (see *Avant-Propos*, p. x) from completing his contemplated work on Rousseau, and only notes had been left, and very valuable notes, too. Aimé Martin decided to include them in the *Oeuvres posthumes*, but in order to make them more acceptable to the public, as he thought, he assumed the delicate task of writing out the book himself with the aid of the notes. He was not a competent person to do it as is well shown in Souriau's "Avant-Propos"; moreover, in itself, it was undesirable that such a work of rearrangement be undertaken at all. In the first place, the literary value would never be equal to that of *Bernardin de Saint-Pierre*; and from the scholarly point of view, that is, to have the book available for scientific purposes, the slightest alteration was still too much.

Let us give an instance: On page 60 (of the Souriau edition) we read that Rousseau had to depend for his living during his last stay in Paris, on 600 francs a year; whatever he needed more, —and he said that he needed altogether 1200 francs a year—he had to earn in copying music. But we know from another source that Rousseau had during this period a larger income which he actually received, but a smaller sum than even the 600 francs upon which he could absolutely depend (see: *Oeuvres*, Ed. Hachette, XII, pp. 243-4). Both pieces of information come directly from Rousseau, it would seem; but both cannot be true. Now, we know that B. de Saint-Pierre misstated some other facts which Rousseau had certainly told him correctly (e. g., Rousseau never told him that he was born in 1708, or that his mother had brought him up); so, we know

that B. de Saint-Pierre cannot be entirely depended upon when he merely reports Rousseau's statements, and that, in case of disagreement with probable statements from other sources, we need not lay too much stress upon B. de Saint Pierre's. But this we did *not* know before, as Aimé Martin had carefully corrected errors similar to those mentioned before publishing his edition.

But leaving aside the question of edition, it is well that the book should be easily accessible now for a good many reasons :

It gives us the best, the most direct information regarding one of the periods of Rousseau's life which is most difficult to understand and to judge impartially. And there B. de Saint-Pierre speaks of facts which he has personally witnessed, and therefore he can be relied upon pretty well. *E. g.* his description of Rousseau's appearance, pp. 31-32 (Souriau edition); the description of his apartment, pp. 31 ss.; their excursions around Paris, pp. 236 ss.; the daily occupations of Rousseau, 49, etc.

It gives some interesting points of comparison with passages of the "Confessions" (which, of course, B. de Saint-Pierre did not know), *e. g.*: the hospice in Turin, p. 34; the Venice episode, pp. 44-5; the love episode in Turin, p. 94; the Misses Galley and Graffenried, p. 95; or anecdotes similar to those told in the "Rêveries," pp. 90-1.

It adds new information—and at places the new edition gives more than the one of Aimé Martin—*e. g.*: the Tante Suzon, pp. 38-39; Rousseau's father, p. 40; concerning the *Devin du Village*, pp. 63, 136; the financial situation of Rousseau, pp. 60, 61, 62, 63 (see what I said above regarding this point). And some opinions of Rousseau concerning men of his time: Voltaire, p. 10; Richardson, pp. 126, 129, 140; Hume, pp. 39-40, 64, 99; or books, like *Astrée*, p. 123.

The information regarding Rousseau's writings, and particularly *Emile*, is very important, pp. 37, 112, 161, 169-173. Rousseau wanted his friend to write a continuation of *Emile*, and, of course, explained to him in detail what he wanted; and from the point of view of Rousseau's development of ideas, the summary now published by Souriau we consider to be a capital document (most romanesque at the same time and bold is this second *Emile*; let us only say that Rousseau is not opposed to polygamy, as

Emile deliberately takes two wives like the patriarch Abraham).¹

I am not prepared to say that all these notes are fascinating reading. The criticism of Rousseau, the comparison of Rousseau and Voltaire offer pretty commonplace views (of course they were not so at the time of Bernardin de Saint-Pierre). Some of the remarks about Rousseau's character are not bad (pp. 73 ss.).

What has been said will suffice to give an idea of the book; we conclude by saying that no Rousseau library is complete without it.

The only thing that we really miss in this excellent book is an Index; a very easy thing to supply in a new edition.

A. SCHINZ.

Bryn Mawr College.

OLD ENGLISH HISTORY.

The Origin of the English Nation, by H. MUNRO CHADWICK, Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1907. (Cambridge Archæological and Ethnological Series.)

Mr. Chadwick is well-known as a learned and patient student of Anglo-Saxon and Germanic antiquities and a cautious, though vigorous antagonist of many of the older theories touching primitive life and institutions. His volume entitled *Studies in Anglo-Saxon Institutions*, published in 1905, was mainly directed toward the solution of some of the most obscure problems in early English history; the volume before us carries the subject back to the days of Anglo-Saxon settlement and thence to the Continent from the fifth to the second centuries. His method of investigation is that of working from the known to the unknown, already successfully utilized by Seebohm, Vinogradoff, Maitland, Round, and others in investigating English history before the twelfth century.

¹ Bernardin de Saint-Pierre declined the offer, and we learn from a letter of Le Bègue de Presle, shortly after the catastrophe of July, 1778, that Rousseau had decided to finish "Emile" himself. (See Musset Pathay's document on the question of the suicide in *Vie et ouvrages de J. J. Rousseau*, Vol. II.)